UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,683	04/10/2001	Mark E. Rose	2072P	1899

57580   7590   12/12/2007
STRATEGIC PATENT GROUP, P.C.
P.O. BOX 1329
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94042

EXAMINER
CHOUDHURY, AZIZUL Q

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 September 2007*.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34 and 36* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34 and 36* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *10 April 2001* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

This office action is in response to the correspondence received on September 11, 2007.

Response to Arguments

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on September 11, 2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,3-6,8-10,12,13,15-18,20-22,24,25,27-30,32-34 and 36 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levergood et al in view of the

FileNet Functionality Sheet, hereafter referred to as Levergood and Functionality Sheet,

respectively.

1. As to claims 1, 13, and 25, Levergood disclose: a method for controlling access

to file on a server over a network, the method comprising: allowing a content

originator to publish a file on a first server and to specify what users are

authorized to access to file (column 3, lines 16-21, Levergood); replicating the file

from the first server on a second server; in response to receiving a URL request

from a client for a file from the first server, determining if a user of the client has

been granted authorization to access the file, wherein a client address apparent

to the first server differs from a client address apparent to the second server

(column 2, line 60 – column 3, line 4, Levergood); generating a transfer ticket

from the first server to the client that includes an identifier identifying the

particular file on the second server if the user has been granted authorization

access, wherein the transfer ticket is not bound to the client address apparent to

the first server (column 3, lines 37-42, Levergood); in response to receiving the

transfer ticket from the client by the second server, redirecting the client back to

the second server with a URL ticket, wherein the URL ticket is bound to the client

address apparent to the second server (column 3, lines 20-42, Levergood); and

in response to receiving the URL ticket from the client, verifying the URL ticket on

the second server and returning the file (column 3, lines 43-49, Levergood).

While Levergood does teach the use of a document management system and

multiple servers (see Column 8, 59-61), Levergood does not specifically teach

allowing a content originator to publish a file on a first server, or specifying user

authorization for a particular file, or file replication. The FileNet Functionality

Sheet, on the other hand, does disclose: allowing a content originator to publish

a file on a first server and to specify what users are authorized to access the file

(see Functionality Sheet, lines 30-35); replicating the file from the first server on a

second server (see Functionality Sheet, lines 56-57). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine

the invention of Levergood with FileNet's product in order to provide ease of use

(see FileNet Functionality Sheet, line 18), system scalability (see FileNet

Functionality Sheet, line 21), and high performance (see FileNet Functionality

Sheet, lines 14-16).

2. With regards to Claims 3, 15, and 27, Levergood further discloses: The web

browser has not been customized to request tickets (see Column 4, lines 24-31).

3. With respect to Claims 4, 16, and 28, the FileNet Functionality sheet discloses:

allowing the content originator to specify what access privileges each user has

with respect to the files, the access privileges including read, write, and delete (see lines 30-35).

4. With regards to Claims 5, 17, and 29, the FileNet Functionality sheet further discloses: allowing the access controls to be specified before and after the file is replicated onto the second server (see lines 30-35).

5. With respect to Claims 6, 18, and 30, Levergood et al further discloses: storing the name of the file in a database along with access privilege specified for the file, and when a user makes a request to access the file, looking up the name of the file in the database and determining if the user has been granted access to the file (see Column 6, lines 58-67).

6. With respect to Claims 8, 20, and 32, Levergood discloses: Placing into the URL ticket a path parameter, a start parameter, a use-by parameter, an end parameter, a uid parameter, a clientid parameter, a sessionid parameter, and referrer parameter, and a message authentication code (MAC) (see Column 5, lines 56-65).

7. With respect to Claims 9, 21, and 33, Levergood discloses: Binding a combination of "basedir+path+sessionid" to an IP address of the client at first use of the URL ticket (see Column 6, lines 5-8).

8. With respect to Claims 10, 22, and 34, Levergood discloses: Verifying the URL ticket as valid when: (i) the MAC is correct, (ii) a current time is between values of the start and use-by parameters, or the "basedir+path+sessionID" combination has previously been sued for the same IP address, (iii) the "basedir+path+sessionID" combination has not been used from a different IP address, and (iv) the URL requests a file that is in a subtree rooted by based ir+"/"path (see Column 6, lines 5-16).

9. With respect to Claims 12, 24, and 36, the FileNet Functionality sheet further discloses: providing a content server as the first server and providing at least one replica server as the second server (see lines 56-57).

10. The motivation applied to claims 1, 13, and 25, are applicable to all their dependent claims.

Response to Amendment

The arguments received on September 11, 2007 has been carefully examined but is not deemed fully persuasive. After evaluating the applicant's arguments and re-evaluating the claims, the 112-type rejection and the finality of the last office action have been withdrawn.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AZIZUL CHOUDHURY whose telephone number is (571)272-3909. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571) 272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AC

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER